



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/577,220	05/23/2000	Daniel Manhung Wong	OR00-01701	4216

22835 7590 02/24/2004

PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP  
508 SECOND STREET  
SUITE 201  
DAVIS, CA 95616

EXAMINER

QUINONES, EDEL H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2131

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/577,220

Applicant(s)

WONG, DANIEL MANHUNG

Examiner

Edel H Quinones

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 1/20/04.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-16 and 19-25 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7, 10-16 and 19-25 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### ***III. Detailed Action***

#### ***Response to Amendment***

1. This Office Action is responsive to the amendment filed on January 20, 2004, in which claims 1, 10 and 19 were amended and claims 8-9, 17-18, and 26-27 were cancelled.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

2. Applicant's arguments filed January 20, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

The Applicant's argues that "the combined system of Gongwer and Alegre teaches a mechanism for **sharing a single database session** with multiple clients" while "the present invention is directed to a system that allows sharing a security context for a user **between two or more database sessions**".

However, Gongwer discloses that session sharing includes a request, by an independent client application, to connect to an existing context of interaction with the data server, created previously by another independent client application (col. 3, lines 3-7). Therefore, it is this context of interaction or "session context" what is being shared, and not the "session" itself. In fact, Gongwer points out that "multiple sessions are sharing a session context" (col. 4, lines 23-24).

According to Gongwer, this session context is the sum of all component Workspaces associated with a session (col. 3, lines 33-34). The Examiner infers that a "security context" is one of the component Workspaces associated with a session. Given that Gongwer discloses that

Art Unit: 2131

the invention can be used to share any session resources between clients (col. 3, lines 35-36), the Examiner infers that the invention can be used to share a security context between clients (i.e. sessions). In fact, Gongwer points out that the security manager 18 can have a Securityspace 19, constructed similarly to the Workspaces 21 and Sessionspaces 25, to maintain exclusive security data across sessions (col. 4, lines 59-62). Therefore, the invention of Gongwer allows the sharing of a security context between multiple sessions.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-6, 10-15, and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gongwer et al (U.S. Patent 6,138,120 and Gongwer hereinafter) in view of Alegre et al. (U.S. Patent 6,199,113 and Alegre hereinafter).

In regards to claims 1, 10 and 19, Gongwer teaches a system for sharing a security context between different sessions on a database server (i.e. a system which formally supports the sharing of session, query, stored procedure, and transaction context across multiple, independent client applications) (col. 1, lines 58-61), comprising:

receiving a request at the database server through a database session between the database server and an application on a database client (i.e. an originating application (client)

Art Unit: 2131

connects to a data server and creates a session, specifying that the session be brand new, and that the new session can be shared by future client connections) (col. 1, lines 44-47);

looking up an identifier for an application client that identifies a client of the application, the identifier having been previously associated with the database session (i.e. the server recognizes the clients by assigning a respective identifier, called a session handle, to each client) (col. 2, lines 1-4);

using the identifier to look up the security context (i.e. exclusive security data) for the application client within a storage area (i.e. Securityspace) associated with the database server (col. 4, lines 59-62); and

wherein the security context includes attributes related to the application client (i.e. additional information which can be used, for example, by the security manager to authenticate clients) (col.12, lines 33-35); and

allowing the application client to use the same security context through a second application and a second database session (i.e. sessHandle<sub>2</sub>) by:

receiving a second request at the database server through the second database session with the second application (i.e. passing the received workspace handle (wsHandle<sub>1</sub>) to the session manager as part of its session initialization procedure);

looking up the identifier for the application client, the identifier having been previously associated with the second database session; and

using the identifier to look up the security context for the application client within the storage area associated with the database server (i.e. updating the mapping table for this session's entry to reference the Workspace of the originating client) (col.12, lines 47-65).

Art Unit: 2131

Gongwer does not teach:

receiving the security context for the application client from the database client;

inserting the security context into the storage area associated with the database server so that the security context can be indexed by the identifier for the application client; and

performing a database operation to satisfy the request;

wherein performing the database operation involves enforcing access rights associated with the security context.

Alegre teaches:

receiving the security context for the application client from the database client (i.e. authentication server first receives the UID and PWD from login process as part of the initial login by the user at client browser) (col. 6, lines 24-27);

inserting the security context into the storage area associated with the database server so that the security context can be indexed by the identifier for the application client (i.e. authentication database stores information defining which users may access resources on trusted network. Authentication database also stores user profile information that defines the types of access each user has to the resources on trusted network.) (col. 6, lines 29-33).

performing a database operation to satisfy the request (i.e. if the session key is still valid, access server performs the request) (col. 4, lines 63-63);

wherein performing the database operation involves enforcing access rights associated with the security context (i.e. authentication database also stores user profile information that defines the types of access each user has to the resources on trusted network) (col. 6, lines 29-31).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Gongwer with the teachings of Alegre to include receiving the security context for the application client from the database client; inserting the security context into the storage area associated with the database server so that the security context can be indexed by the identifier for the application client; and performing a database operation to satisfy the request; wherein performing the database operation involves enforcing access rights associated with the security context with the motivation to achieve a higher level of security for a trusted network in order to allow access by users on the Internet in a controlled and secure manner (Alegre, col. 2, lines 33-35).

In regards to claims 2, 11 and 20, Gongwer teaches wherein the request includes a database query (i.e. transaction) directed to a database (figure 1, element 5) on the database server (figure 1, element 10). The Office infers that conducting a transaction with a database server comprises directing a query to the database.

In regards to claim 3, 12 and 21, Gongwer does not teach wherein performing the database operation involves modifying the database query to enforce access rights associated with the security context.

Alegre teaches wherein performing the database operation involves modifying the database query to enforce access rights associated with the security context (i.e. the trusted network access presentation information is created based on the user access profile, and thus includes only selection for accessing resources that the user has access to) (col. 4, lines 44-47).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Gongwer with the teachings of Alegre to include wherein performing the database operation involves modifying the database query to enforce access rights associated with the security context with the motivation to achieve a higher level of security for a trusted network in order to allow access by users on the Internet in a controlled and secure manner (Alegre, col. 2, lines 33-35).

In regards to claim 4, 13 and 22, Gongwer does not teach wherein the identifier for the application client identifies a user of the application that is sending the request to the database server.

Alegre teaches wherein the identifier for the application client identifies a user of the application (i.e. user ID [UID]) that is sending the request to the database server (col. 4, lines 24-26).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Gongwer with the teachings of Alegre to include wherein the identifier for the application client identifies a user of the application that is sending the request to the database server with the motivation to achieve a higher level of security for a trusted network in order to allow access by users on the Internet in a controlled and secure manner (Alegre, col. 2, lines 33-35).

In regards to claim 5, 14 and 23, Gongwer teaches wherein the database client is an application server that is sending the request to the database server (i.e. the clients are preferably application programs. The application programs can be executing on common computer or on distinct computers) (col. 2, lines 32-34).



Art Unit: 2131

Gongwer does not teach wherein the identifier for the application client identifies an application session between the application on the application server and the client of the application.

Alegre teaches wherein the identifier for the application client identifies an application session between the application on the application server and the client of the application (i.e. the packet may be created by merely concatenating a web server identifier, speaker object identifier, or other identifier, to the session key and URL request received from the user). The Office infers that "other identifier" includes the use of an identifier of the application session between the application on the application server and the client of the application.

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Gongwer with the teachings of Alegre to include wherein the identifier for the application client identifies an application session between the application on the application server and the client of the application with the motivation to achieve a higher level of security for a trusted network in order to allow access by users on the Internet in a controlled and secure manner (Alegre, col. 2, lines 33-35).

In regards to claim 6, 15 and 24, Gongwer teaches receiving a request from the application to change the application session associated with the database session; and changing the application session associated with the database session (i.e. applications can create, and actively share a session) (col. 11, lines 64-65).

Art Unit: 2131

4. Claims 7, 16 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gongwer in view of Alegre as applied to claims 5, 14 and 24 above, in further view of Chatterjee et al. (U.S. Patent 6,243,751 and Chatterjee hereinafter).

The teachings of Gongwer and Alegre have been discussed above.

The combination of Gongwer and Alegre, however, does not teach further comprising facilitating connection pooling by periodically changing the application session associated with the database session in order to channel requests associated with multiple application sessions through the database session.

Chatterjee teaches further comprising facilitating connection pooling by periodically changing (i.e. switching) the application session associated with the database session in order to channel requests associated with multiple application sessions through the database session (col. 3, lines 39-55).

Therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the teaching of Gongwer and Alegre with the teachings of Chatterjee to include further comprising facilitating connection pooling by periodically changing the application session associated with the database session in order to channel requests associated with multiple application sessions through the database session with the motivation to allow more users to use a server than the number of connections established with the server (Chatterjee, col. 3, lines 25-27).

Art Unit: 2131

***Other Prior Art Made of Record***

5. A. Lo et al. (US Patent No. 5,809,505) discloses a system and method for relational to object mapping;

B. Bowman-Amuah (US Patent No. 6,556,659) discloses a system for service level management in a hybrid network architecture; and

C. Carpenter (US Patent No. 6,199,068) discloses a mapping interface for a distributed server to translate between dissimilar file formats.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2131

*Points of Contact*

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Edel H Quiñones whose telephone number is 703-305-8745. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (8:00AM-5:00PM).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz Sheik can be reached on 703-305-9648. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-305-3718.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.



Edel H. Quinones  
Patent Examiner  
Technology Center 2100

February 18, 2004



AYAZ SHEIKH  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100